



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called Mr. McGarry to inform him that claims 4-7, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 were in condition for allowance. Examiner informed Mr. McGarry that she indicated claim 11 allowable, in error, and Hasegawa et al. does in fact disclose a pivotal handle (fig. 1, #1a, unlabeled pin attachment). Therefore, amended claim 8, which incorporates claim 11, is still rejectable under Hasegawa et al.. Mr. McGarry suggested inserting the presence of at least one supporting wheel wherein the detector is aligned with and adjacent to the at least one wheel to detect its rotational motion. Mr. McGarry pointed out that Hasegawa et al. has two supporting wheels(5), however the detector(6s) is aligned with a 'sensor' wheel(6) that does not support the apparatus. Though the sensor wheel is contacting the ground, it is mounted on a swing arm(7) that is pivotally mounted to the frame of Hasegawa et al. and therefore structurally would not be able to be considered a 'supporting' wheel. Examiner agreed with this argument. It was agreed that the pivotal handle of former claim 11 would be removed from claim 8 and re-introduced as a dependent claim. Mr. McGarry agreed to change in claim 4, as outlined in the attached Examiner's Amendment, to provide for proper antecedence. .